## **NOAA California B-WET Program**

# Evaluation Plan 1 Example

## **Teacher Workshop Overview**

The purpose of this evaluation is to assist workshop presenters and partners with determining the effectiveness of the summer 20XX teacher enhancement workshop.

This workshop brings together high-school teachers with scientists, graduate students and informal educators to examine current, local marine scientific research. The format consists of a 5-day summer professional development workshop and a follow-up, school-year outreach program during which graduate students support classroom teachers as they incorporate new ideas and materials into their curriculum.

The goals of the workshop are to

- 1) enhance teachers' understanding of how research data is collected and used in resource management and protection of the marine environment
- 2) provide teachers with techniques for incorporating meaningful watershed and marinerelated experiences into their core science curriculum.

#### Audience

This evaluation will focus on the high-school teachers who participate in this teacher workshop.

#### **Evaluation Goals**

The main questions (goals) for the evaluation are:

- 1. Which aspects of the workshop worked well? Which didn't work? Is the workshop length, format, etc., appropriate? What changes would improve the workshop?
- 2. What did teachers gain from the workshop? Did the workshop provide teachers with meaningful experiences and learning opportunities? Are they excited about the possibilities of using what they learned in their classrooms?
- 3. What's the impact of the workshop on the teachers who attend? Which of the workshop ideas, methods, materials do they use? Does the workshop change their teaching and in what ways?

Research shows that implementation of new ideas, methods and/or curriculum by teachers occurs in stages and takes time (Fuller, 1969; Hall et al 1975). The research "suggests the importance of paying attention to implementation for several years, because it takes at least three years for early concerns to be resolved and later ones to emerge.... We know that teachers need to have their self-concerns addressed.... We know that management concerns can last at least a year...when new approaches to teaching require practice and each topic brings new surprises. We also know that help over time is necessary to work the kinks out and then to reinforce good teaching once use of the new practice smoothes out. Finally, with all the demands on teachers...they never have the time and space to focus on whether and in what ways students are learning.... We know that everyone has concerns...and that acknowledging these concerns and addressing them are critical to progress in a reform effort" (Loucks-Horsley in Bybee, 1996).

For those reasons, this evaluation will focus on evaluation questions 1 & 2 during the summer workshop and question 3 during the school year.

## **Evaluation Design and Time Table**

To gather the data needed to answer the evaluation questions, all teacher participants will complete a pre-workshop survey (see Appendix 1) on the first day of the workshop. At the end of each day, we will ask teachers for feedback on the day's events and activities via a survey form (see Appendix 2), then discuss their concerns or questions. On the last day of the workshop, all teacher participants will complete a post-workshop survey (see Appendix 3). During the school year, we will ask teacher participants to complete a follow-up survey (Appendix 4) to determine what from the workshop they have implemented.

### Schematic

Timing	May 20X1	Monday, July XX	Tuesday thru Thursday	Friday, July XX	May 20X2
	finalize evaluation plan and instruments	pre- workshop survey	daily feedback survey & discussion	post- workshop survey of participants	follow-up survey of participants

## Data Tallying & Analysis

The surveys (Appendices 1 through 4) use a mix of questions (items) to collect qualitative and quantitative data. Responses to qualitative items will be categorized, then tallied. All responses will be reported as frequencies and percentages of responses in each category. Responses to quantitative (rating-scale) items will be tallied and reported as frequencies and averages.

Data from the pre-workshop survey will be compared to responses on the post-workshop and follow-up surveys to track changes in participants over time.

#### References

Fuller, F.F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal* 6(2): 207-226.

Hall, G.E. et al. (1975). Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. *Journal of Teacher Education* 26(1): 52-56.

Loucks-Horsley, S. (1996). The concerns-based adoption model (CBAM): A model for change in individuals. In R. Bybee (Ed.) Professional development for science education, a chapter in *National Standards & the Science Curriculum*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, Company.

Newhouse, C.P. (2001). Applying the concerns-based adoption model to research in computers in classrooms. *Journal of Research in Technology Education (JRTE)* 33(5).

# Appendices Not Included In this Example